

**UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE****Patent and Trademark Office**

Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS  
Washington, D.C. 20231

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------

09/285,773 04/05/99 MERCALDI

G M4065.165/P1

IM52/1030

EXAMINER

THOMAS J D'AMICO  
DICKSTEIN SHAPIRO MORIN & OSHINSKY  
2101 L STREET NW  
WASHINGTON DC 20037-1526

UMEZ ERONINI, L

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

1765

20

DATE MAILED:

10/30/01

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

**Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks**

<b>Advisory Action</b>	Application N .	Applicant(s)	
	09/285,773	MERCALDI ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Lynette T. Umez-Eronini	1765	

**--The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --**

THE REPLY FILED 18 October 2001 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE. Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to avoid abandonment of this application. A proper reply to a final rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be either: (1) a timely filed amendment which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee); or (3) a timely filed Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114.

**PERIOD FOR REPLY [check either a) or b)]**

a)  The period for reply expires \_\_\_\_\_ months from the mailing date of the final rejection.

b)  The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection.

**ONLY CHECK THIS BOX WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).**

Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

1.  A Notice of Appeal was filed on \_\_\_\_\_. Appellant's Brief must be filed within the period set forth in 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 1.191(d)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal.

2.  The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered because:

(a)  they raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);

(b)  they raise the issue of new matter (see Note below);

(c)  they are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or

(d)  they present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.

**NOTE: See Continuation Sheet.**

3.  Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): \_\_\_\_\_.

4.  Newly proposed or amended claim(s) 1 and 9 would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).

5.  The a) affidavit, b) exhibit, or c) request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: See Continuation Sheet.

6.  The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered because it is not directed SOLELY to issues which were newly raised by the Examiner in the final rejection.

7.  For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendment(s) a) will not be entered or b) will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.

The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:

Claim(s) allowed: 88-93.

Claim(s) objected to: none.

Claim(s) rejected: 1-7, 9-11, 13-18, 22-29, 33-35, 39-41, 82 and 83.

Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: none.

8.  The proposed drawing correction filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is a) approved or b) disapproved by the Examiner.

9.  Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s). \_\_\_\_\_.

10.  Other: \_\_\_\_\_

Continuation of 2. NOTE: In claims 1 and 2, deleting "hydrofluoric acid" raise new issues that would require further consideration.

Continuation of 5. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: Applicant's argues Holoubek (CS 8801729 A) fails to teach a non-aqueous etching composition comprising of least two inorganic acids; and isopropanol, in claim 82 and ethylene glycol, in claim 39-41, and 83. Applicants' arguments are unpersuasive because Holoubek's composition comprises a mixture of nitric acid and hydrofluoric acid diluted in ethylene glycol. Conventional non-aqueous organic solvents include isopropanol, ethylene glycol, and propylene glycol. Substitution of one solvent for another are seen as equivalent because they are non aqueous organic liquids. Substitution of one for the other would have been obvious for the purpose of obtaining the best etchant composition.



BENJAMIN L. UTECH  
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER  
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 1700